

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 03-4093

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

versus

LEONARD ANDREW SAYLES, JR., a/k/a Leno,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Southern District of West Virginia, at Charleston. Charles H. Haden II, District Judge. (CR-99-198)

Submitted: September 30, 2003

Decided: February 17, 2004

Before NIEMEYER, LUTTIG, and TRAXLER, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

John G. Hackney, Jr., Charleston, West Virginia, for Appellant.
Kasey Warner, United States Attorney, John J. Frail, Assistant
United States Attorney, Charleston, West Virginia, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.
See Local Rule 36(c).

PER CURIAM:

Leonard Andrew Sayles, Jr., appeals his resentencing following remand and the district court's order denying his motion for a new trial. As to the motion for a new trial, we have reviewed the briefs, the joint appendix, and the district court's order denying the motion for a new trial and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm for the reasons stated by the district court. See United States v. Sayles, No. CR-99-198 (S.D.W. Va. Jan. 7, 2003). Sayles also filed motions seeking to submit a pro se supplemental brief challenging the quantity of drugs attributed to him as relevant conduct. Although we grant Sayles' motions,* we decline to address this issue because it is beyond the scope of our remand. United States v. Bell, 5 F.3d 64, 66 (4th Cir. 1993). We deny Sayles' request for oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

AFFIRMED

*We also grant Sayles' pro se motion for citation of supplemental authorities.